

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, further examination and reconsideration of the objections and rejections in the Office Action of October 3, 2008 are respectfully requested.

The specification and abstract have been carefully reviewed and revised to make grammatical and idiomatic improvements in order to aid the Examiner in further consideration of the application. The amendments to the specification and abstract are incorporated in the attached substitute specification and abstract. No new matter has been added. Also attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and abstract by the current amendment. The attachment is captioned **“Version with Markings to Show Changes Made.”**

In item 1 of the Office Action, the title of the invention is objected to for not being descriptive. The title of the invention has been amended to be more clearly indicative of the invention, and it is submitted that this objection is now inapplicable. Thus, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

In item 2 of the Office Action, the abstract is objected to for containing greater than 150 words. The abstract has been amended to contain less than 150 words, and to improve the language. Thus, this objection is now inapplicable, and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

In items 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claims 5-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter; in items 5 and 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 5-8 and 10 have been revised to recite a computer aided design (or graphics) program stored in a computer-readable recording medium. Further, claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 have been amended to clarify the language indicated as indefinite by the Examiner. Thus, it is submitted that these rejections are no longer applicable to the claims, and their withdrawal is respectfully requested.

In items 7-13 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,256,038 (“Krishnamurthy”) in view of US Patent

6,201,549 (“Bronskill”). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons below, and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 recite a CAD system, a CAD program stored in a computer-readable recording medium, a computer graphics system, and a computer graphics program stored in a computer-readable recording medium, respectively, comprising a device or process for computing coefficients of a first fundamental form at a mesh point and a device or process for computing coefficients of a second fundamental form at the mesh point. This is not disclosed in the prior art of record.

Krishnamurthy discloses a CAD system for designing curved surfaces. However, Krishnamurthy does not disclose a device or process for computing coefficients of a first fundamental form at a mesh point and a device or process for computing coefficients of a second fundamental form at the mesh point, as recited in claims 1, 5, 9, and 10, nor was it relied on as disclosing such in the Office Action.

Bronskill discloses defining tangent and normal vectors to a curved mesh surface, in particular at column 6, lines 10-24, as indicated in the Office Action. However, Bronskill does not disclose a device or process for computing coefficients of a first fundamental form at a mesh point and a device or process for computing coefficients of a second fundamental form at the mesh point, as recited in claims 1, 5, 9, and 10.

In particular, Bronskill does not disclose a device or process for computing coefficients of a first fundamental form at a mesh point, the coefficients of the first fundamental form being defined at the mesh point by a first tangent vector and a second tangent vector which define a tangent plane of the mesh at the mesh point, as recited in claims 1, 5, 9, and 10.

Further, Bronskill does not disclose a device or process for computing coefficients of a second fundamental form at the mesh point, the coefficients of the second fundamental form being defined at the mesh point by a tangent vector in the tangent plane at the mesh point and a normal vector of the mesh at the mesh point, as recited in claims 1, 5, 9, and 10.

Thus, the present invention as recited in claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 is not disclosed or suggested by the combined disclosures of Krishnamurthy and Bronskill. The deficiencies of Bronskill are not obviated by any of the prior art of record. Accordingly, it is submitted that

claims 1, 5, 9, and 10, as well as claims 2-4 and 6-8 depending therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels that there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Masami MIURA et al.

/Aldo A. D'Ottavio/

By: **2009.01.05 18:48:04 -05'00'**

Aldo A. D'Ottavio

Registration No. 59,559

Agent for Applicants

AAD/WDH/kh
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 5, 2009